



# THE TRI-WEEKLY YEOMAN.

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY  
S. I. M. MAJOR, & CO.,  
ST. CLAIR ST., OPPOSITE THE COURT-HOUSE.

TERMS.

One copy, per annum, in advance. \$4 00

FOR PRESIDENT,  
JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE,  
OF KENTUCKY.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,  
GENERAL JOSEPH LANE,  
OF OREGON.

SATURDAY.....SEPTEMBER 1, 1860.

DIXON VS. DIXON.

The antecedents of the leaders of the Douglas faction in this State are as ring-streaked and striped in complexion as the celebrated short-horns that old Jacob obtained from his father-in-law by Yankee ingenuity. We have already exposed some who were once Democrats, while the bare mention of others of the T. Lovel Jones variety was enough for our purpose. We come now to a gentleman of another stripe—Mr. Dixon—who, while the Whig party lasted, was one of its most able and popular leaders, and one of the most determined and gallant opposers of Democratic men and measures. For the last five years, however, he has floated about rather promiscuously on the political streams—if we are correctly informed—splitting his ticket in 1855, supporting Buck and Breckinridge in 1856, and voting for Josh Bell, slave code and all, in 1859. Now he has squatted in a more definite attitude. He was picked up as a political waif—we suppose—by Harney's Convention, and made one of the Douglas electors for the State at large. Mr. Dixon never was a Democrat—had no interest as a party man in the Charleston and Baltimore Conventions, and cannot, therefore, like a number of misguided men who were Democrats, claim to support the Illinois Senator on account of the vote cast for him in these Conventions. He cannot offer this paltry excuse, and if we understand him rightly, he himself would offer no other explanation of his attitude than a sincere conviction on his part that the platform and views of Judge Douglas were perfectly sound and correct. He must indorse Squatter Sovereignty in all its hideous details as expounded by the "little giant." We say he must do all this, for to assert otherwise would be to say that he had no claim to respectful attention from a Kentucky audience.

Mr. Dixon now believes that "the people of a Territory can, by lawful means, exclude slaves from their limits prior to the formation of a State Constitution," for this is the Douglas platform expressed in the very words of Douglas himself. A glance at the records will show that in assuming this position Mr. Dixon is guilty of the most ridiculous inconsistency. In 1840 he was a member of the Convention that made our present State Constitution. In that body, it appears, he did not believe that the people of a sovereign State through their chosen delegates assembled according to unquestioned forms and usages to establish a Constitution, had either the power or right to exclude or abolish slavery within their own State limits. Where the devil a Squatter Legislature can obtain such a right or power we leave him to answer at his leisure. Here is the document to which we refer:

Mr. DIXON offered the following resolution:

WHEREAS, The slaves of the citizens of this Commonwealth are property, both those that are now in *our* care, and those hereafter born of mothers who may be slaves at the time of such birth. Therefore,

Resolved, That this Convention has not the power or right, by any principle it may incorporate into the Constitution of the State, to deprive the citizen of his property, without his consent, unless it be for the public good, and only then, by making to him a just compensation therefore.

*Debates of the Convention*, p. 112.

Mr. Dixon made a speech in support of these resolutions, in the Convention upon the 15th October, 1849, from which we quote the following:

Mr. DIXON— \* \* \* I assert \* \* \* that slaves are property, as well those now in existence as those who may be born hereafter of mothers, who at the time of birth are slaves; and I maintain that a bare majority of the Convention, nay, that the whole of the Convention has no power to take from the citizen his property, without his consent, or without making him compensation.

I have presented this resolution, because I desire to call the attention of the people of Kentucky to it. I have proposed it, because I am myself entirely opposed to surrendering in the hands of the Convention, any other Convention hereafter to be assembled, the right to seize upon private property and appropriate it, as the Convention may think proper, without regard to the public good. And finally, when the public good demands it, I insist upon it that it cannot be taken unless compensation be made for it.

*Debates of the Convention*, p. 113.

This resolution and speech are a sufficient answer to all the Squatter Sovereignty arguments he can make between this and the November election.

**Election Returns.**

The official returns from Jackson and Laurel have come to hand, as follows:

Jackson—Combs, 146; McClarty, 186; Simpson, 133; Peters, 242.

Laurel—Coombs, 353; McClarty, 287; Simpson, 311; Peters, 347.

The Yancey-fears and Squatters are very much exercised about the speech that Breckinridge is going to make at Lexington. Some of them really entertain fears that he will make a Union speech. We cannot allay their apprehensions. We cannot promise them that Breckinridge will not be for the Union, the Constitution and the enforcement of the laws. In fact it is a little too much to expect him even for their accommodation to depart from his antecedents or his platform. We expect him, however, to be for the maintenance of the Constitutional rights of all sections of the Confederacy, the South included, and for the perfect equality of the States. These Yancey-fears and Squatters have made poor headway in attacking Breckinridge. He is likely to continue, even if he were to make a thousand speeches, invulnerable to all their assaults.

Hon. John C. Mason—An Incident.

A correspondent of the Louisville Journal, who signed himself "X," writing from Frankfort under date of May 17th, 1859, undertakes to report a conversation which occurred between Major Mason and the editor of this paper in reference to the question of Congressional protection. That Mason then denounced non-intervention as little or no better than free-soilism we remember very well, as must every one else who heard him talk. Of course we do not pretend, at this date, to endorse the statements contained in this letter to the Journal as a *verbal* report. Every body knows Mason would not use such ugly words as "d—d" and "h—l," but still he may have denounced non-intervention in his mild and courteous style of debate. We copy a portion of this letter from the Journal of May 19, 1859, and let it go for what it's worth:

Among the number of distinguished strangers in our midst, is the Hon. John C. Mason, of Bath, who is interested in an important suit. Of course his presence excited some attention among the "unfriendly." The "Central Clique" became curious to know his views. \* \* \* \* \* In reference to the question of slavery in the Territories. Well, they got no chance to know his views. The editor of the Yeoman and two other Democratic leaders, one of whom was a member of the State Central Committee, had an interview on yesterday with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Mason denounced in the bitterest terms the doctrine that Congress shoult not interfere to protect slavery in the Territories; that the idea that the courts could give "adequate protection" was a humbug and a delusion. The Yeoman man and his two colleagues remonstrated. They endeavored to explain and "soften down matters," but Mason couldn't be reconciled. \* \* \* \* \* He was incorrigible, and he said that if they came into his country and advocated any such d—d abolition doctrine, that Congress should not interfere to protect the rights of slaveholders in the Territories, they would be beat all to h—l. He deemed the non-protection movement in Kentucky as an attempt to sell Southern rights for Northern Abolition votes in the Presidential contest, and for one he was unduly opposed to it.

**Nullification or Disunion—Which?**

The Louisville Journal is now uttering daily denunciations against Yancey founded upon his advice to Slaughter, on the 15th June, 1858, to organize the true men of the South for prompt resistance to the next aggression upon its Constitutional rights. This excited general debate, in which participated all the more prominent members.

Mr. Davis especially remarked that the difference between Mr. Douglas and himself consisted in *who are the people*—in the point at which the people do possess and may assert their right. It is not the *inhabitants* of the Territory, but the people as a political body—the people organized—who have the right, and on becoming a State, by the authority of the United States, exercising sovereignty over the territory, that may establish a fundamental law for all time to come."

To this bill was offered an amendment by Mr. Davis, to prevent the restraining clause being so exercised as to prohibit the protection necessary to any property in the Territory. This excited general debate, in which participated all the more prominent members.

Mr. Davis especially remarked that the difference between Mr. Douglas and himself consisted in *who are the people*—in the point at which the people do possess and may assert their right. It is not the *inhabitants* of the Territory, but the people as a political body—the people organized—who have the right, and on becoming a State, by the authority of the United States, exercising sovereignty over the territory, that may establish a fundamental law for all time to come."

Mr. Dickinson entertained similar views. Mr. Clay coincided, and expressed the opinion that "the provisions of the Constitution and laws of the United States authorized the introduction of negro slaves into the ceded Territory, and abrogated all local laws forbidding it."

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*; it is the Wilmot Proviso, as far as we go.

And Mr. King, of Alabama, than whom a more uncompromising Democrat or purer patriot never lived, and who reflected the sentiments of the South upon this question, in reply to Mr. Douglass, said:

Mr. King— \* \* \* I am opposed to the territorial legislature in power either to prohibit or introduce slaves. I have no faith that the power does not exist on the part of Congress, and in that respect I differ from the Senator from Illinois *in toto*. Sir, his argument is a *free-speech*;



